

ANTHROPOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

VOLUME 33

OCTOBER 1960

NUMBER 4

CARIBBEAN ISSUE

CONTENTS

Land Tenure and Transmission
in Rural Barbados.....SIDNEY M. GREENFIELD 165

A Typology of Rural Community
Forms in the Caribbean.....MICHAEL M. HOROWITZ 177

Cultural Models and Land
Holdings.....MORRIS FREILICH 188

The Catholic University of America Press
WASHINGTON 17, D. C.

(Second Printing - February 1968)

Catholic Anthropological Conference

OFFICERS

Honorary President, RT. REV. MSGR. WILLIAM J. McDONALD

President

ALLEN SPITZER

Secretary

REGINA FLANNERY HERZFELD

Vice-President

GOTTFRIED O. LANG

Treasurer

JAMES A. MAGNER

EXECUTIVE BOARD

THOMAS GLADWIN

SR. BERNARD COLEMAN

FRANK LYNCH, S.J.

JOHN T. MCGEE, C.S.C.

LOUIS LUZBETAK, S.V.D.

MATHIAS KIEMAN, O.F.M.

THOMAS REESE

MICHAEL KENNY

JOHN TRUDEAU, O.M.I.

The aims of the Catholic Anthropological Conference are: The advancement of anthropological sciences through promotion of (a) anthropological research and publication by missionaries and professional anthropologists, and (b) anthropological training among candidates for mission work.

Membership is open to all interested in the aims of the Conference, and includes subscription to ANTHROPOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

Active members \$ 5.00 a year
Contributing members 10.00 a year

Sustaining members \$ 25.00 a year
Life members 100.00

Applications for membership and other communications should be addressed to the Secretary of the Conference, Department of Anthropology, Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

The ANTHROPOLOGICAL QUARTERLY is edited by the Department of Anthropology, The Catholic University of America.

Editor

REGINA FLANNERY HERZFELD

Associate Editors

MICHAEL KENNY
GOTTFRIED O. LANG

Advisory Board

HUGH BIHLER, S.J.

JEAN COMHAIRE

JOHN PUTNAM, M.M.

Business Manager

JAMES A. MAGNER

Published quarterly, January, April, July, and October, by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price: Yearly \$4.00. Single number \$1.00.



ANTHROPOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Volume 33

1960

CONTENTS

Social Class in a French Village.....	JULIAN PITT-RIVERS.....	1
Patterns of Patronage in Spain.....	MICHAEL KENNY.....	14
Patterns of Kinship, Comparaggio and Community in a South Italian Village.....	LEONARD W. MOSS and STEPHEN C. CAPPANNARI.....	24
Marital Property Considerations Among Peasants: An Italian Example.....	DONALD S. PITKIN.....	33
Aspects of Turkish Kinship and Social Structure.....	ROBERT F. SPENCER.....	40
A Death and a Youth Club: Feuding in a Turkish Village.....	A. P. STIRLING.....	51
The Transition from Serf to Peasant in Eastern Europe.....	LAWRENCE KRADER.....	76
Notes and News.....		91
Recent Changes in Family Struc- ture in an Indian Village.....	MORRIS E. OPLER.....	93
Changing Social Stratification in a Dutch Village.....	ROBERT T. ANDERSON and GALLATIN ANDERSON....	98
Child Training Among Tyrolean Peasants.....	FRADA NAROLL.....	106

Acquiring Status in Guajiro Society.....	ANTONIO SANTA CRUZ.....	115
Notes and News.....		128
Birth Customs of the Tawsug, Compared with Those of Other Philippine Groups.....	FRANKLIN EWING, S.J.....	129
Some Aspects of the Soul-Concept Among the Bantu-Speaking Nguni Tribes of South Africa.....	BRIAN M. DU TOIT.....	134
Urbanization in Nigeria.....	HUGH H. SMYTHE.....	143
A Modern Ethiopian Play: Selfstudy in Culture Change.....	SIMON D. MESSING.....	149
The Activity Bias of Ethnography and the History of Society.....	HUGO O. ENGELMANN.....	158
Notes and News.....		164
Land Tenure and Transmission in Rural Barbados.....	SIDNEY M. GREENFIELD.....	165
A Typology of Rural Community Forms in the Caribbean.....	MICHAEL M. HOROWITZ.....	177
Cultural Models and Land Holdings.....	MORRIS FREILICH.....	188
Index to Volume 33.....		198

LAND TENURE AND TRANSMISSION IN RURAL BARBADOS*

By SIDNEY M. GREENFIELD
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

M. G. Smith began a recent article describing the system of land tenure and transmission practiced by the peasant section on the island of Carriacou with the following paragraph:

Two highly distinctive systems of land tenure are to be found side by side in many British Caribbean societies. One system is defined by statute and common law, and guides official policy in relation to land. The other system, which has recently been described for Jamaica by Miss Edith Clarke, is of customary and traditional character which neither observes the forms nor directly invites the sanctions of law. These differing systems of tenure are normally practiced by different sections, and for holdings of disparate value (Smith 1956: 103).

For both Carriacou and Jamaica, then we now have descriptions of a traditional system of land tenure by which peasants customarily transmit their holdings — either informally or by bequest — to both legitimate and illegitimate children. "According to customary belief and practice family land passes to 'all the family' or 'all the children' and may be used jointly by a group of kindred who subscribe towards the 'tax money'" (Clarke 1953: 83). On both islands these holdings are considered inalienable and reserved for the use of *all* children — existent and potential. Both Clarke and Smith maintain that this system is not in conformity with the legal pattern. They differ, however, in that according to Clarke, "The peasant theory of land tenure... [reflects]... West African principles... (*Ibid.*: 87) while Smith sees it as a functional adaptation to the social structure of Carriacou (Smith 1956: 138; 1957: 42).

In this paper I shall discuss the system of land tenure, use and

*An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Mexico City, December, 1959. The research upon which it is based was conducted in 1956-57 and was supported by fellowships from the Social Science Research Council and the Research Institute for the Study of Man.

transmission found among the rural folk of the island of Barbados. I shall show that they also believe in and practice — at least in part — a traditional system of land tenure that is similar to the family land concept of the Jamaicans and Carriacouans. I shall demonstrate, however, that when its historical emergence is examined, this system of tenure is found not only to be in complete harmony with the law, but is actually based upon it. The present system of family land — which is dependent upon a form of transmission called “seed to seed inheritance” — will be shown to have been an application by the rural folk of certain principles of the English common law of an earlier period. This pattern was also employed by the upper classes in both Barbados and England. The rural landholders, we shall see, adapted this upper class pattern in order to protect themselves and their offspring, under the law, from a series of restrictions — called the “located labor system” — imposed upon the laboring classes by the legislature in the years following emancipation.

The English common law of real property, however, was consolidated and modified during the second decade of the twentieth century. In its revised form, when applied in Barbados, the law no longer sanctioned “seed to seed” inheritance. The system of family land itself — which once provided the Barbadian villager with a legal means of escape from “located labor” — no longer invites the sanctions of law. The new judicial principles, however, have spread slowly to the rural areas since its inhabitants only learn of changes in the law by hearing them from judges in court. Local custom, not fully aware of the new code with respect to land, still provides sanctions for the old beliefs and associated behaviors.

Barbados is a relatively flat, small, pear shaped island, 21 miles long and 14 miles wide situated at the eastern rim of the Lesser Antilles. It contains approximately 166 square miles or 106,470 acres. This land area supported an estimated population of 230,000 — increasing at a rate of two per cent per year — at the time of this study. The island's density of almost 1,400 persons per square mile is the highest in the Caribbean and, for an area of tropical agriculture, one of the highest in the world (Lowenthal 1957).

The economy of the island is based almost exclusively on one crop — sugar — which, with its by-products, accounted for more

than 95 per cent of Barbados' exports and 45 per cent of the gross domestic product in the period 1951-55 (Statistical Service 1956). The importance of sugar to the overpopulated colony is made vivid in the conclusions reached by the architects of Barbados' Ten Year Development plan in 1946. "In the long run," they declared, "everything brings us back to sugar; sugar is the life blood of the island!" (1946: 11).

Almost all of the arable land is planted with sugar cane. The crop is grown both on large plantations — which control 76,000 acres of land, of which 54,000 are arable — and by "peasants"¹ who hold approximately 18,000 acres, 14,500 of which are estimated as arable (Foster 1956: 1). A survey conducted in 1946 revealed that peasant land was divided into more than 27,000 holdings that concerned an estimated 125,000 persons — 65 per cent of the population recorded in the last census (Halcrow and Cave 1947: 2). For information about the system of land tenure and transmission practiced by these numerous peasants — who are so dependent on the land — we shall turn to the data collected in the rural village of Enterprise Hall in the years 1956-57.

Enterprise Hall is a small village of a little over one hundred acres, located in the Parish of St. George near the center of the island. In 1956-57, approximately one hundred years after its establishment, it contained 630 inhabitants who occupied 135 dwellings. The one hundred some odd acres of land were distributed in 187 holdings ranging in size from one-eighth of an acre to one piece that was five and one-fourth acres. The average size of each holding is one-half acre. Rights of ownership and use of the land are held by both village residents and outsiders — a term which includes both occupants of other villages or plantation tenancies and people living outside the island.

Two conflicting sets of attitudes were held by the villagers with respect to land tenure. The first, and traditional belief, is that land should be left to and shared by all children — without reference to birth order and legitimacy. The peasants say that "the old people" bequeathed their land in this way; and since they were wise, their example should be followed. This ideal, however, is often neglected in practice. The modern tendency toward individual ownership and freedom to alienate the land — which at

¹The term "peasant" is used in Barbados to refer to a proprietor with less than ten acres of land. The term is used here in that sense only.

times leaves some members of the family landless — is in conflict with the older theory and often produces disharmony, and at times, open hostility among kin. The villagers rationalize their present behavior by saying "if people lived lovin'," as they were assumed to have done in the "old'n days" they all could share. But since others are selfish, they too must be selfish.

Most villagers do not have title deeds to their holdings. The few who do, either have purchased the property in the recent past, or have obtained title in court under the Statute of Limitations — according to which an individual can obtain title to land after possession for ten years without paying rent. Since the fees associated with obtaining title under the Statute of Limitations are beyond the means of most peasant proprietors, even those who know that they have a legitimate claim to land usually do not exercise it — unless they wish to sell the land. Most proprietors, however, are unaware of the Statute of Limitations.

In the eyes of the villagers there are two major categories of land — "buy ground" and "rent ground." The term "buy ground" is generally applied to all holdings that are owned — in any form of tenure — as compared with land that is rented. In its more specific usage, however, "buy ground" refers to land that has been either purchased by the proprietor, or inherited — "free and clear" — from the purchaser. The villagers believe that this land is individually "owned" by the proprietor and can be sold, bequeathed or given away according to his wishes.

The second type of "buy ground" is referred to as "family land." It differs from individually owned land in that it is believed to be inalienable and to belong to all members of the family. The villagers regard "family land" as subject to the claims and interests of several generations of kin who may be scattered over many parts of the earth. They see the proprietor as the trustee for the kinship group. In addition, they adhere to the firm belief that this type of land should not be sold without agreement by all members of the family. In most cases the property was left by the family founder — either informally or in a written document — to all his descendants. The phrase "seed to seed inheritance" is used to describe the form of transmission that is the basis of this type of tenure. In recent years some of the land in this category has been subdivided and parceled out to all of the recognized claimants. In spite of the subdivision, however, the land has retained

the essential qualities of family land since each proprietor believes that he has only the right to till the land and reap the profits from it during his lifetime; at his death it must pass on to his seed.

"Rent ground" is also divided into two types. The first is land that is rented from the plantations. In the past the tenant on this land was greatly restricted as to his geographic and occupational mobility. Since the war, however, the restrictions have been lifted and, today, the renting party's responsibilities to the plantation are not significantly different from those of any rent paying tenant in the western world.

The second type of "rent ground" is a product of the family land system. If some of the members of a family do not wish to press their claims to the family property at present, but are afraid that their kinsman in possession will attempt to take title under the Statute of Limitations, they insist that he either sell the land and divide the proceeds or rent it to himself or to a third party. Since selling, in addition to being unprofitable to the occupant, means alienation out of the family, the land is never sold. Renting, which keeps "ownership" within the family even though an "outsider" is in possession, is the usual choice. Renting is also a solution when there is a dispute over land "owned" by a family, some of whom are not on the island. Here the proprietor usually holds the property in trust for his absent kinsmen. Where the latter desire to safeguard their interests against the occupant's invoking the Statute of Limitations, they require him to pay rent, or to turn the land over to a tenant.

We see then, that the Barbadian villagers have a traditional system of land tenure and transmission similar to that practiced in Jamaica and Carriacou. According to tradition, the land is considered inalienable and the peasants leave their holdings to all their children or all the family. Since this practice is opposed to contemporary legal theory and invariably leads to conflict and family disharmony at times of transmission — "it causes humbug and murderation" according to the villagers — we shall now turn to the historical emergence of the system of "family land" and "seed to seed" inheritance to see how it developed.

At emancipation in 1834 more than 82,000 former slaves were given freedom in Barbados. The fruits of liberty, however, were not to be tasted by the vast majority. The colony was densely populated and fully cultivated. There were neither mountains

nor jungles to give refuge to the freedmen. Most of them had little alternative but to remain as wage laborers on the same plantations they formerly served as slaves. Here they remained in possession of their houses and allotments, paying no rent, but giving labor in lieu thereof, usually five days per week at a rate some 20 to 30 per cent below the prevailing market rate (Hamilton 1957: 4). Their even limited mobility, however, soon showed itself to be at odds with the wishes of the planters, especially when agricultural workers left the estates of their traditional settlement to work elsewhere for higher wages. To strengthen their bargaining position in the newly created labor market, the planters turned to the legislature.

In the decade following emancipation, several laws that became the basis of the "located labor system" were enacted that set strict limitations on the occupational and physical mobility of the laboring classes. The laws — aimed directly at the agricultural workers — stipulated that as a condition of renting — either "working allotments" or "housespots" — the tenant was required to give the estate a certain number of days labor at a fixed wage, varying from one-sixth to one-third below the current market price. Furthermore, the tenant was obliged to perform the service required by the landlord who was sole judge of the rights of each party (*Ibid.*: 4).

Land, which was both scarce and expensive in the densely populated colony, was the cornerstone of the new legislation. Consequently, its ownership — which provided the only means of escape from "located labor" — was even more coveted by the laborers. The price of the small supply soon soared. In spite of this, however, the number of landowners increased. By 1859, the number of small proprietors with less than five acres of land had increased from 780 in 1840 (Schomburgk 1848:153) to more than 3,500 (Sewell 1859: 39).

Most of the holdings of the growing class of small proprietors had formerly been parts of large plantations. The land, therefore, was distributed throughout the island in clusters, or "villages." One such village was Enterprise Hall. At the end of the eighteenth century it had been a small, family owned plantation. In a will dated 1816 it had been bequeathed by its owner to his grandson who departed from the island soon after emancipation. The 102 and $\frac{3}{4}$ acres were purchased then by a solicitor for

£3,500 and, after being surveyed and subdivided, they were put up for sale in the early 1850's. The selling price varied — by as much as £50 per acre — but averaged £70 per acre. The purchase was usually made on terms. Half the total price was given as a down payment and the remainder plus interest in several installments. Possession was taken at the time of the down payment. Until 1891, Barbadian law, like English law, did not require registration of title. Consequently, only a handful of the original purchasers recorded their deeds.

The settlement pattern was one of dispersed "farmsteads," much the same as it is today. Houses were placed as close to the road as possible and almost surrounded by growing crops. The system of farming was also similar to that practiced today. The land was divided in half, one part planted in cane, the other again divided, one part in yams and/or potatoes in preparation for cane and the other, "thrown out" of cane, to roots and fodder. In this way the land was cropped with sugar cane to be reaped in alternate years while the other half produced food and fodder² (for details see Skeete 1930: 2-8; Halcrow and Cave 1947: 21-27).

The proprietors of these small holdings were not bound to the plantations as "located laborers." They were free to seek more remunerative and prestigious employment elsewhere. Most of the men became artisans, trained as masons, carpenters, blacksmiths, wheelwrights, saddlers and factory specialists. Since their work required them to travel to distant parts of the island, they had little time — or inclination — to till their land themselves. Tillage, consequently, was left to the hired hands who worked under the supervision of the village women.

From the beginning the land was secondary to a man's job as a source of income. Its primary value was that it freed its owner from the restrictions of the located labor system. Realizing this, the village founders were careful to make sure that their children would retain an interest in the land at their death — and with it continued freedom and opportunities for mobility. To accomplish this, they employed a legal technique borrowed from the local

² In recent years, however, with new varieties of cane that produce excellent ratoons for several years, little land is ever "thrown out." An additional cane crop, therefore, can be harvested from the section that was formerly "thrown out" before it is prepared again for planting new cane.

upper class who, in turn had taken it from the English upper class. In order to keep their property within the family the English landowners would make a "settlement," under which future generations were left a limited, or "entailed" interest in the family "estate." Under the provisions of the settlement the land became inalienable, or perpetually retained within the family.

As Cheshire states:

The desire of the upper classes to order the future destiny of their land and to prevent it from being sold out of the family, which has been a feature of English social life for many centuries, requires attention. . . . The inclination of a fee simple owner. . . , is to make what is called a *settlement* by which he retains the benefit of ownership during his own life, but withholds the entire ownership in the shape of the fee simple from his descendants for as long as possible by reducing them, one after another, to the position of mere limited owners (1958:69).

"Settlements in one form or another," he continues, "have been common since. . . the early thirteenth century, . . ." (*Ibid.*:69). The evolution of the form, however, "was complete towards the end of the seventeenth century" (*Ibid.*: 71).

The English doctrine of "estates" is ideally adapted to the objectives of the settlement. "English law has never applied the conception of ownership to land" (*Ibid.*: 27), though the person in whom its seisin (possession) is vested is entitled to proprietary rights in respect of it. English law has created an abstract entity called an "estate" which is interposed between the land and the owner. In the eyes of the law, the estate is owned, transferred and transmitted, not the land. Therefore, under the settlement, each descendant inherited restricted or limited rights in an estate. In this way both the theoretical and practical ownership of the land became inalienable within a designated class of heirs of the person creating the settlement.

Under common law, settlements entailing interests in land could be made by deed or will. In either case, the creator of the entailment, by his choice, could limit future interests in his property to a certain class of heirs. He could choose the heirs of his

body, the heirs of his marriage, the heirs of his wife's body, or any other class of heirs he preferred. The significant feature of the settlement then, is that it transfers an inalienable and perpetual interest in an estate to a class of heirs that is selected by the person creating the settlement.

The founding fathers of Enterprise Hall used the settlement to entail the interests of "all their descendants," thereby insuring all of their future generations an interest in their property and with it a refuge from the plantations and the located labor system. The descendants of those who did not protect their offspring in this way, soon returned to the unenviable status of located laborer.

The elders of Enterprise Hall invariably created settlements by leaving a will at their death. Many of these documents were quite detailed and specific. Some individuals went so far as to create different classes of heirs to share in each of their several parcels of land. In general, however, all of the documents shared certain basic features. There are two main provisions found in almost all of the dispositions that are basic to understanding both the legal principles upon which they were based and the contemporary pattern of family land. First, *all* children — male and female, legitimate and illegitimate — were almost always included amongst the beneficiaries. Second, and more important, the document invariably contained a clause that read as follows: "I . . . (name of testator) . . . bequeath to . . . (names of *all* children) . . . and their seed forever . . ." followed by an enumeration of the property in question. This terminology — commonly referred to as the "seed to seed" clause — had several important legal implications. One was that it begged the question of legitimacy of issue. The class of heirs selected was the seed of the body. Thus the intent of the testator not to restrict interest to legitimate issue was established in law. In addition, the land became factually and legally inalienable and perpetually retained within the family as long as there were issue. Each generation also inherited no more than a life interest in the estate. Each member of the family obtained the rights and privileges associated with ownership but never actual ownership. By applying the principle of the settlement the village founders were able to maintain their descendants perpetually above the status of located laborer.

We must point out that there were ways of evading the limitations of entailing settlements (see Cheshire 1958: 167-169). Sev-

eral embittered informants reported cases of heirs with only a life interest in an estate "going to court" and "obtaining papers." The land was then sold and the seed of the village founder subsequently forced back to the plantation tenancies and the restrictions of located labor. These cases, however, were statistically infrequent.

Though testamentary disposition was the general rule, several cases were brought to the author's attention in which the original purchaser died intestate. According to the law, the oldest legitimate son could have claimed the entire property, limited by the "dower" or life interest of the lawful widow. In practice, however, very few "legal heirs" pressed their claims in court. In most cases the land was simply divided amongst all the children in much the same manner as it would have been if the purchaser had left it in strict settlement to all his seeds.

Though all children usually inherited an interest in the family property, there was informal agreement that once a son purchased land of his own or a daughter married a property owner, they and their heirs would not press their claims to the family land since they no longer needed the protection it offered. In the event that they lost their rights in this other land they could then reassert their claims to the family land.

Family land based upon seed to seed inheritance was established in Barbados in the second half of the nineteenth century. Subsequent changes, however, both in sociological conditions and in the legal system served to modify both the attitudes of the villagers toward the land — particularly family land — and to alter its legal status. We must pause, however, to emphasize that the concept of family land had its roots in the common law of the time and was a functional adjustment — with legal sanction — to a situation that existed on the island for almost one hundred years. The end of the located labor system, plus the legal changes that followed the statutory consolidation of the English real property laws in 1925, which were later applied in Barbados, may have changed the legal status of family land and seed to seed inheritance, but they did not change the fact that this traditional set of beliefs emerged within the island as a response — recognized by law — to a set of legally imposed social restrictions.

One of the main objectives of the legislature of 1925 was "... to render the sale of land as rapid and simple a matter as the sale

of goods or of shares" (Cheshire 1958: 5). To accomplish this, the ability of landowners to entail the interests of their heirs was restricted — by formalizing the rulings against perpetuities. The intestacy law was also changed so that all real estate of the intestate was to be sold and the money divided amongst the heirs. One effect of the 1925 legislation then, was to end the legal status of family land. Under the new law, wills granting a perpetual interest in land to all future descendants were no longer binding. Now the persons in possession of the land, or their parents, if named in the will, had outright ownership. Where the parent died without making further provisions for the next generation the land would be sold and the money given to the heirs — if the case was brought to court. Most villagers, however, knew little of the statutory changes. For many years they believed that the old rules were still binding. Consequently, they followed the traditional pattern established by their ancestors. It was only when they went to court with land disputes that they learned of the new regulations.

Both legal and social conditions in Barbados have changed in the past half century. This does not, however, give us the right to disregard the antecedent cultural patterns. The understanding of an aspect of culture such as a land tenure system requires both diachronic as well as functional analysis. The examination of the historical conditions associated with the emergence of the family land system in Barbados gives us no reason to suspect that the peasant theory of land tenure is derived from a cultural tradition other than the one in which it is found. There is, therefore, no need to look for an external source in explaining peasant attitudes and beliefs about land that are not in conformity with contemporary legal theory. I agree with Clarke that "... few laymen in any country fully understand the intricacies of their own legal system" (1953:86). I see no reason, however, to assume that English legal and social tradition was incomprehensible to the peasants of the British West Indies (*Ibid.*: 86). If anything, this paper suggests the opposite.

REFERENCES CITED

- CHESHIRE, GEOFFREY
1958—The Modern Law of Real Property. London, Butterworth and Co., Ltd.
- CLARKE, EDITH
1953—Land Tenure and the Family in Four Communities in Jamaica. *Social and Economic Studies* 1: 81-118.
- FOSTER, C. B.
1956—The Yield of Sugar Cane in Barbados in 1956. Bulletin No. 24 of the Department of Science and Agriculture. Bridgetown, Barbados.
- HALCROW, M. AND J. M. CAVE
1947—Peasant Agriculture in Barbados. Bulletin No. 11 of the Department of Science and Agriculture. Bridgetown, Barbados.
- HAMILTON, BRUCE
1956—Barbados and the Confederation Question 1871-1885. London, Crown Agents for Oversea Governments and Administrations.
- LOWENTHAL, DAVID
1957—The Population of Barbados. *Social and Economic Studies* 6: 445-501.
- SCHOMBURGK, SIR ROBERT
1848—The History of Barbados. London, Longman, Brown, Green and Longman.
- SEWELL, WILLIAM G.
1859—The Ordeal of Free Labor in the British West Indies. New York, Harper and Brothers.
- SKEETE, C. C.
1930—The Condition of Peasant Agriculture in Barbados. The Department of Science and Agriculture. Bridgetown, Barbados.
- SMITH, M. G.
1956—The Transformation of Land Rights by Transmission in Carriacou. *Social and Economic Studies* 5: 103-138.
1957—The African Heritage in the Caribbean. In *Caribbean Studies: A Symposium*, Vera Rubin ed. Jamaica, Institute of Social and Economic Research.
- STATISTICAL SERVICE OF BARBADOS
1956—Abstract of Statistics No. 1.
- A TEN YEAR DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR BARBADOS, 1946-56. Bridgetown, The Advocate Co., Ltd.

A TYPOLOGY OF RURAL COMMUNITY FORMS IN THE CARIBBEAN¹

By MICHAEL M. HOROWITZ
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio

In every society known to the ethnographic record there are social systems which provide for the socialization of all members to the behavioral patterns of their ancestors. These systems include all the categories of culture — i.e., family, kinship, religion, economics, politics, *rites de passages*, etc. — that are necessary for the continuance of the culture and its transmission to the next generation. They function to teach the young of the culture how to be participating adults. Similar, in a sense, to the isolate of biology, they are the smallest units in the society which provide for sustained cultural transmission and variation, and which permit the emergence of new forms which will themselves be sustained and transmitted. Such systems are termed "communities."

In complex societies the community is no longer coterminous with the society itself. Therefore, as anthropology turns increasingly to the study of such societies, we must have some means of identifying and comparing the constituent kinds of communities. We must have a meaningful taxonomy of them based on a set of conventions of description which insure the comparison of like events. We find most useful the indices of space, time, and personnel, as formulated by Conrad Arensberg in his classification of American communities (1955:1146). They are not formal or arbitrary boundaries but are natural parameters of interaction.

We shall attempt to identify the range of community forms which are found in so limited an area as the insular Caribbean and British Guiana, the region which Charles Wagley has aptly termed "Plantation America." "Throughout this sphere," he writes, "there seems to be a weak sense of community cohesion, and local communities are but loosely organized" (1957:8). He suggests that this may be responsible for the lack of community

FOOTNOTE:

1. This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Anthropological Society held at the University of Indiana in April, 1960. Field research in Martinique during 1956, 7, and 8 was supported by fellowships from the Social Science Research Council and the Department of Anthropology, Columbia University, to which grateful acknowledgment is hereby recorded.

description in the ethnographic reporting for the area; although we have considerable information about such problems as acculturation, family organization, race and ethnic relations, and historical survivals, we are seldom presented with a clear statement of the community in which these problems were investigated.

The peasant *commune* of Morne-Paysan in Martinique appears to represent a community which has a high degree of integration. It can be located on a continuum with other communities in the West Indies which range from the rather tightly "closed" to the relatively "open," of the kind Wagley had in mind. These types do not seem to be randomly distributed but are in relationship to particular socio-economic organizations. The hypothesis advanced is that peasant life is associated with the tightly integrated kind of community, while that of the plantation workers is associated with the open community. The broad categories of community organization are related to the productive technology and economy of the people. Within these categories there are subtypes or classes finer drawn, sharing a greater number of qualitative similarities. These specifics of form within the broad categories have to do with the particular culture history of the people, especially in terms of specific derivations in Europe.

A tightly integrated community is one in which the great majority of significant interactions of its members occurs within its bounds. It is probably endogamous, or in a relationship of spouse exchange with a narrowly restricted number of other communities. In an open community a marital partner may come from anywhere, with the result that the community location of any member's affinal kin may be different from that of any other's. There is, then, an independence and potential conflict between community and affinal kinship.

Membership is free and easy in the open community, restricted in the tightly integrated. The former requires only a partial involvement of the person in its activities. One may be a member for limited periods of time, for example, during the crop season only, and then move on. There is here a greater degree of sub-cultural variation for it makes less demands on the total loyalty of its members. Thus, it may include groups in active competition for scarce goods, competing political and religious groups. In this sense, the open community is more "urban" than the tightly

integrated, for there is greater possibility for anonymity on the part of its members.

The elusive attribute of *esprit de corps* is pronounced in the tightly integrated community, where the members have a vested interest in the perpetuation of their way of life and identification with it. They are more likely to have developed a sense of "we-ness" and a recognition of their differences from other communities. As long as a member maintains a stake in the community, for example, continues to own a piece of land, he may leave and yet have a guaranteed right to return to full participation at any time. The open community provides little distinction between the person who returns and the one who enters for the first time.

Before turning to the comparative material, we shall comment on the terms "peasant" and "plantation." Redfield follows Wolf's definition of the peasant as one for whom "agriculture is a livelihood and a way of life, not a business for profit," and adds Kroeber's observation that the peasant community always stands in some relationship to urban centers, which serve them as markets for the disposal of their surplus produce (Redfield 1956:27,29). Thus defined, the peasant community differs from his earlier conceptualization of it as having an "all-providing self-sufficiency" (1955:4). Wolf distinguishes between peasant owners and tenants, seeing the two as each having distinct implications (1955:453). My research in Morne-Paysan does not necessitate the dichotomy. Most persons are at the same time owners and tenants, and the alternatives do not appear to have important structural correlatives.

In my definition of the peasant the amount of land under his control is relatively small, and surplus production limited or non-existent. The primary purpose in agriculture is to feed himself and his family. In addition, land is a scarce commodity, and cannot be abandoned or allowed to lie fallow for very long, even though productivity may decline as a consequence of uninterrupted cultivation.

Plantation workers form the vast agricultural proletariat of the Caribbean. Their labor is a commodity which is exchanged for cash. They have no control over the production or distribution of the crop. The nature of the crop provides only seasonal employment, so that for much of the year plantation workers have only occasional work. Most must provide for their own lodging,

but each plantation in Martinique maintains a small group, called *gens casés*, housed rent-free on the estate, and in a paternalistic relationship with the *patron* reminiscent of that of slavery.

The large number of studies which have been done in recent years in the West Indies precludes reference to anything more than a sample in the present paper. We have selected for comparison reports, from eight areas within the region, which have been specifically concerned with the nature of the community itself. We have neglected, of necessity, several excellent studies which concentrate rather on specific problems, such as on family organization, or religious cults, or race relations, or African retentions and reinterpretations.

The charts at the end of this paper list what appear to be the salient facts — both structural and attributional — which are relevant to the typology. Unfortunately, not all of the reports are sufficiently complete to allow a full listing for each community. There is, however, enough information to enable us to suggest a tentative classification as to degree of integration:

1. Most integrated: Morne-Paysan (Martinique); Orange Grove (Jamaica); Mocca (Jamaica).
2. Moderately integrated: August Town (British Guiana); Canalville (British Guiana); Tabara (Puerto Rico).
3. Least integrated: Sugartown (Jamaica); Cañamelar (Puerto Rico).

The first three are characterized by a high degree of communal activity, corporateness of household groupings, and a wide extension of extra-household kinship obligations. In addition, they have limited stratification and a relatively stable population. All three are ethnically homogeneous. The members do not migrate seasonally for outside employment, nor do outsiders enter in search of work. This seems to be related to the fact that although all three are in close proximity to sugar estates, they are able to derive enough income from work on their own lands throughout the year so that there is little necessity to leave. In Canalville the peasant is likewise accorded higher status than the cane laborer, but there the individual plots do not provide enough return to permit a total devotion to horticulture.

The second three are characterized by populations much more mobile, with constant movement from the town to the sugar estates and, in August Town, to the bauxite fields. Although they are all peasant areas, in August Town and Tabara concentration

is on a cash crop (rice in the former, tobacco in the latter), rather than on provisions. Canalville is the only one of the three in which there is any development of exchange labor groups, a feature which characterizes both Morne-Paysan and Orange Grove. (The plots in Mocca are too small to require exploitation by any group beyond the household). Tabara has a well-developed class system, with attendant activities restricted to the members of a given class. Canalville is ethnically complex, restricting, through limited intermarriage, a wide extension of kinship ties which would serve further to integrate the community.

Finally, Sugartown and Cañamelar are devoted to plantation cane production. Here there is no peasantry, but an agrarian proletariat with no control over the process of production beyond organization into labor unions. Not only are there differences in orientation among the rigidly distinct classes in these communities, but these orientations are in direct conflict: the elite is concerned with producing cane as efficiently and economically as possible; the workers are interested in raising wages and prolonging the cutting season. The frequency of strikes in these areas is an index of the lack of integration in the sugar fields.

While there appear to be no West Indian communities which approach the degree of integration achieved in the Central American "closed corporate community" reported by Wolf, the data available indicate that the major factor in determining the relative degree of integration in the West Indies is the kind of tenure and exploitation of land. Where land is held in relatively small holdings, exploited by the household group, and sold in local markets, there seems to emerge a community structure which unites the population by bonds of kinship (real and ritual) and mutual assistance. Where the land is held in great estates, or where the population is forced to sell its labor in an industrial situation, the associated community structure does not serve to join all the members in a common matrix. Rather, it results in a stratified system which opposes the establishment of a wide range of mutual assistance. In the peasant community, the emphasis is on the household and larger groupings for economic and other activities; in the plantation community the emphasis is on the individual. Among West Indian peasants, labor is generally not a commodity. The plantation worker, however, has nothing else to sell.

Such sentiments as "we are all one family" do not seem to appear in the literature for the plantation towns. In the three high-

ly integrated communities the statement is literally true; descended from the original settlers, joined again through intermarriage, the people are kin to each other. Until kin ties are established, outsiders remain outsiders, although they may have lived in the community for many years.

Religion does not appear to be an important factor except where a plurality of cults competing for membership tends to divide the community. Neither is ethnic descent, as such, an important element, although again it may become significant in those communities characterized by a plurality of ethnic groups in which the members of each view themselves as distinct from the others. In Canalville, for example, persons of East Indian ancestry tend to see themselves as separate from those of African descent, and vice versa.

The settlement pattern appears to have more to do with the historical antecedents of the community than with the kind of integration which developed. This is an area in which more study is needed. Careful descriptions of the patterns which obtain in the West Indies should be made and culture-historical studies would indicate continuities with similar patterns in other areas. Conrad Arensberg (1955) has demonstrated connections between various community patterns in the United States and those of the Old World. We have tried to point out the relationship between the settlement use of space in Morne-Paysan and in Brittany (1959). Such work will require the joint efforts of the ethnographer and historian.

Population size and density are factors which influence the kinds of community structure found. The West Indian islands are among the most densely populated rural areas in the world. It is unnecessary to elaborate on the increasing poverty caused by a continual expansion of population without an expansion in the opportunities for employment. In Morne-Paysan, the increasing demographic pressure has forced an immigration from the community to the city, with some movement of the young to the sugar fields. This has the effect of making labor a commodity which, although not yet an important factor within the community, may make for modifications in the system of exchange labor. Sheer size is also important, for people in towns as large as the Puerto Rican *Municipios* cannot experience the extensive face-to-face relationships which are characteristic of the other areas. The effective interpersonal area for these people is something

much smaller than the *municipio* as a whole: the *barrio*, *poblado* or *colonia*. But these units do not provide the total range of services necessary for full cultural participation; the result seems to be that in Puerto Rico the *municipios* themselves are internally divided into rural and urban elements, with attendant divergencies in orientation.

To summarize, West Indian rural community structures range from tightly integrated, corporate-like systems to open, loosely integrated ones. Associated with the former is a peasant economy, based upon exploitation by household units of small plots. Associated with the latter is a plantation economy, based upon modern techniques of sugar cultivation with labor supplied by landless workers. I have argued that the demands of these two types of agricultural activities has much to do with the kind of integration extant in the community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ARENSBERG, C. M.
1955—American communities. *American Anthropologist* 57.
- CLARK, EDITH (Sugartown, Orange Grove, and Mocca)
1957—My mother who fathered me. George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London.
- HOROWITZ, MICHAEL M. (Morne-Paysan)
1959—Morne-Paysan: peasant community in Martinique. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, New York.
- MANNERS, ROBERT (Tabara)
1956—Tabara: subcultures of a tobacco and mixed crops municipality, in J. Steward (ed.), *The people of Puerto Rico*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana.
- MINTZ, SIDNEY (Cañamelar)
1956—Cañamelar: the subculture of a rural sugar plantation proletariat, in J. Steward (ed.), *The people of Puerto Rico*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana.
- REDFIELD, ROBERT
1955—The little community. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
1956—Peasant society and culture. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- SKINNER, ELLIOTT P. (Canalville)
1955—Ethnic interaction in a British Guiana rural community. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, New York.
- SMITH, M. G.
1956—Community organization in rural Jamaica. *Social and Economic Studies* 5.
- SMITH, R. T. (August Town)
1956—The Negro family in British Guiana. Grove Press, New York.
- WAGLEY, CHARLES
1957—Plantation America: a culture sphere, in V. Rubin (ed.), *Caribbean studies*, a symposium. Institute of Social and Economic Research, Jamaica.
- WOLF, E.
1955—Types of Latin American peasantry: a preliminary discussion. *American Anthropologist* 57.

CHART ONE

Community	Population to nearest 50	Form of Settlement	Source of Income	Ethnic composition (Primary ancestry of residents)
Morne-Paysan	1650	<i>bourg</i> — administrative center (non urban) <i>quartiers</i> — dispersed farms and homesteads	Sale of produce from own holdings in urban markets	African
August Town	1750	Line village of houses with all lands behind village	1) wage labor on sugar estate and in bauxite fields 2) own farms	African
Canalville	700	Line village of houses with all lands behind village	1) market sale from own lands 2) wage labor on sugar estates	African East Indian
Tabara	17000	<i>Municipio</i> <i>Pueblo</i> — urban center <i>barrio</i> <i>poblado</i>	1) wage labor on farms 2) sale of tobacco to cooperatives and produce to urban markets	European
Cañamelar	20000	<i>Municipio</i> <i>pueblo</i> <i>barrio</i> <i>colonia</i> Factory-in-field	Wage labor on sugar estates	African European
Sugartown	1200	Factory-in-field Class segregated housing Barracks for estate laborers	Wage labor on sugar estates	African European Chinese East Indian
Orange Grove	700	*Village with surrounding dispersed household clusters	Sale of produce from own holdings in urban markets	African
Mocca	400	*Village with surrounding dispersed household clusters	Subsistence horticulture	African

*information from M. G. Smith (1956:297-298)

CHART TWO

Community	Stratification	Exploiting Unit	Tenure of Productive Holdings	Religion
Morne-Paysan	Limited	Household. Exchange labor groups	1) Fee simple: individual and undivided family. All children (legitimate) inherit. 2) Share tenancy ("fifty-fifty") 3) Rent tenancy	Roman Catholic
August Town	Considerable	Individual	1) Productive lands in fee simple 2) Pasturage rented from Crown	Congregational Anglican and other groups Few Roman Catholics
Canalville	Limited	1) Household exchange labor groups 2) Individual	Fee simple	Various Protestant groups Hindu Moslem
Tabara	Considerable but fluid	1) Household 2) Individual (wage laborers)	1) Fee simple—lands bought rather than inherited 2) Share tenancy (<i>a medias</i>)	Roman Catholic Various Protestant groups
Cañamelar	Rigid	Individual (wage laborers)	(Housed free on estates or on government lands) Corporate owned estate	Roman Catholic Various Protestant groups
Sugartown	Rigid	Individual (wage laborers)	1) Fee simple—all children inherit. "Family lands" and "bought lands" 2) Corporate owned estates	Jehovah Witnesses Various Protestant groups Pocomania
Orange Grove	Limited	1) Household 2) Exchange labor groups	Fee simple—all children inherit. "Family lands" and "bought lands"	Protestant
Mocca	Slight	Household	Fee simple—all children inherit. "Family lands" and "bought lands"	Protestant

CHART THREE

Community	Population Stability	Expressions of community solidarity and tensions
Morne-Paysan	Few outsiders enter community Endogamous Few leave to work on sugar estates	"Tout le monde est parent." Collective building of town hall. Limited recourse to courts to settle internal disputes. All households represented at wakes. Households are corporate.
August Town	Endogamous Migration to sugar estates and bauxite fields	"All one family." "Black folks' village" All households represented at wakes. Families and households not corporate.
Canalville	Constant turnover of personnel	Extensive use of courts to settle internal disputes. Ethnic stereotypes. "No trespassing" signs. "Boxes"
Tabara	Continual movement in and out of area. Seasonal migration of <i>agregados</i> to coastal estates.	Class differences in religion. Upper class clubs.
Cañamelar	Large number of outsiders enter during crop time.	"Nosotros del barrio." Restricted social interaction among classes.
Sugartown	Large number of outsiders enter during crop time.	Household not corporate. Class differences in residential areas.
Orange Grove	Do not migrate for wage labor.	Household is corporate. Collective building of town hall.
Mocca	Do not migrate for wage labor.	Household is corporate. Stranger identified as "Bluefoot" even after several generations.

CHART FOUR

Community	Kin and Ritual Kin Ties	Times
Morne-Paysan	Both well-developed. Market role for women.	Short dead (dry) season. Many times of total assemblage: wakes, special masses, patron saint. Saturday market.
August Town	"Little development of... reciprocal kinship obligations."	Migration of young out during sugar crop season.
Canalville	Market role for women. Some development of godparent ties.	Regular cultivation throughout year with some daily movement to plantation and back to village during crop time.
Tabara	Weak <i>compadrazgo</i> .	1) 3 months dead time in tobacco. 2) Commerce active from November through April, season of sale of tobacco.
Cañamelar	Limited kin ties. Strong <i>compadrazgo</i> .	1) 6 months dead time. 6 months crop time. 2) No times of total assemblage.
Sugartown	Resident core of persons related by ties of kinship.	1) 6 months dead time. 6 months crop time. 2) No times of total assemblage.
Orange Grove	Well-developed kin ties.	Saturday market. Regular times of total assemblage.
Mocca	Well-developed kin ties.	Regular cultivation throughout year.

CULTURAL MODELS AND LAND HOLDINGS

By MORRIS FREILICH
The University of Akron
Akron, Ohio

In recent years the term "model" has become popular in anthropological writings. In this paper I would like to present a basic problem in model analysis, to propose an answer that is possible in some cases, and to analyze briefly some theoretical implications which follow from such an approach. According to Lévi-Strauss, models have the following characteristics (1953:525):

First the structure has the characteristics of a system. It is made up of several elements none of which can undergo a change without effecting changes in all the other elements. . . (and) the model should be so constituted so as to make immediately intelligible all the observed facts.

What then, we might ask, is a model? Paul Meadows answers this question as follows (1957:4):

Every model is a pattern of symbols, rules and processes regarded as matching, in part or in totality, an existing perceptual complex. *Each model stipulates* thus, *some correspondence with reality*, some relevance of items in the model to reality, and *some verifiability between model and reality* (italics mine).

The problem I wish to probe is exactly this matter of "correspondence with reality," this "verifiability between model and reality." Namely: how do we know at a given time that a model which we have constructed of a given culture or sub-culture is, in fact, an accurate representation of the facts? In the social sciences, unlike the more experimental sciences, it is often difficult to evaluate adequately the model of a given scholar. The complexity of the subject matter, the fact that the mere presence of the investigator changes the phenomenon under study, the personality of the investigator, etc., all tend to put a subjective bias on our models. How then can we check on the validity of a given model that we have constructed?

Insofar as a cultural model isolates elements which are considered of critical importance, it is in a sense a kind of generalization of ethnographic data. A useful check on any kind of generalization is its predictive abilities; that is, to what extent can predictions be made on the basis of the generalizations; what is the degree of specificity of such predictions; and to what extent are the predictions accurate? Predictions based on cultural models could therefore be used as a check on such cultural models. In a previous paper (Freilich 1958) I attempted to predict behavior patterns of Mohawks in the future, based on a model I constructed on present-day Mohawk culture. A problem which seems inherent in such a method however, is one of *time* — must we wait a decade or two before we can evaluate the validity of our models?

In certain instances, if predictability is used as a check on cultural models, waiting may be necessary; in others, however, it may be possible to evaluate a model within a short time of its construction. At times, it may be possible to predict that which has already occurred. Prediction of the past could thus provide a quick check on our models. The *past* must not be too long, since the assumption here is that the cultural model (or models) from which predictions are being made has remained *essentially* the same for the period under consideration. In effect, having constructed a model of a cultural system, what is being said is: "If this model is a valid representation of the ethnographic facts, and if this system has remained essentially the same for X years, what phenomena can I predict to have occurred during these X years?" Predictions could then be made; the phenomena predicted to have occurred can then be examined, and such a check would thus provide information on the cultural models that were constructed.

Two factors must be kept in mind in this matter of prediction of the past. First, obviously, that which is being predicted must not be known to us at the time of prediction. Second, only certain kinds of data can be used for predicting the past, and for validating the model from which predictions are being made. That is, a relationship should exist between the cultural system used for prediction and that which is being predicted. If we call that which is being predicted (*p*) and the cultural model used to predict (*K*), then the relationship between the two could be stated as: $p = f(K)$. The two systems (the cultural and "*p*")

are not independent, but one is rather a function of the other. To make the point clearer with an obvious example—cultural models cannot be used to make predictions about the stars or the weather. Thus for purposes of model verification, only systems related to cultural systems can be used for prediction.

Ideally, the material to be predicted should be *quantitative* data, since such data would allow us to make highly specific predictions. A possible source of data which is both quantitative and related to cultural systems is land records. Such land records would be particularly useful where a number of ethnic groups share a common habitat. If a number of ethnic groups are studied, then the cultural models could be used to predict possible changes in land holdings among these ethnic groups. For example, given a situation where a number of ethnic groups do peasant farming in a given area, we can attempt to predict what possible changes in the land situation have occurred for a given past period. We might predict that one group has gained land at the expense of another, that there were periodic losses by one group which were later recovered, etc. Having made the predictions, the land records can be referred to as a check on the cultural models. Perhaps an example from my field work in Trinidad would help to clarify these points. During the period August 1957 — June 1958 I lived in an ethnically mixed village in Eastern Trinidad, and collected ethnographic data from East Indian and Creole peasants. During the last few months of this period, I was able, through the services of a clerk in the Registrar General's Office, to get historical information on 124 land holdings which included all the land in the village and some land in the surrounding area.¹ The total area for which I obtained these land figures was 1620 acres. The data covered a period of approximately 60 years.

The ethnographic data which I collected was later analyzed in terms of two cultural models — one for the East Indians and one for the Creoles. I used the following as points of reference for the two models: *Time, Space, People, Authority Structure, Exchange System, Sanctions and Goals*. The point of reference "People" — was further sub-divided into — *Basic Kinship Unit* and *Associa-*

¹ The writer is indebted to the Social Science Research Council for a fellowship that made this study possible. He is also indebted to the Honorable Mr. Deeble (The late Registrar General of Trinidad) for his help in permitting one of his assistants to collect information for me on the land holdings here being discussed.

tional Patterns. With respect to each of the points of reference, I asked myself a question and attempted to answer it from the point of view of the ethnographic data collected. Thus:

- Time.....What is the basic time orientation of the group; is it the present, the past, or the future?
- Space.....In what area is most living done, and under what circumstances is there an extension of this area?
- People.....What is the basic kinship unit of the group, and what is the nature of associational activities?
- Authority Structure....What is the nature of order-giving and order-receiving in the group?
- Exchange System.....What kinds of exchanges occur with respect to a. Goods and Services? b. Women?
- Sanctions.....What sanctions effectively control behavior in the group?
- Goals.....What kinds of behavior receive most prestige per unit of time, energy, and expense incurred?

It is outside the scope of this paper to go into the nature of these models any further². However, a summary of the models is presented in figure 1.

² For a more complete description of these models see Freilich's "Cultural Diversity Among Trinidadian Peasants". Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, February 1960.

Figure 1

Models of East Indian and Creole Cultural Systems

<i>Points of Reference</i>	<i>Cultural Systems</i>	
	EAST INDIAN	CREOLE
Time	The Future	The "Now"
Space	Village; Extended by Permanent Villages of Kin	Village; Extended by Temporary Fête Centers
People		
Kinship Unit	Corporate, Consanguineal Patrilineal	Non-corporate-Matrilineal, Consanguineal
Associational Patterns	With Family	With Friends Freely Chosen
Authority	Patripotestal, Rigid Hierarchal	Loose, Equalitarian
Exchange Goods and Services	Money Medium of Exchange	Money and Sexual Services Media of Exchange.
Women	Indirect, Permanent, Between Joint Families	Indirect, Temporary Between Matri-focal Families
Sanctions	Supernatural, Polytheistic	Social (Natural), Plus Fatalism
Goals	Family Improvement	Fête

Recently, I started to analyze the data I had obtained from the Registrar General in Trinidad, and asked myself the following question: If my models of the cultures of Creoles and East Indians in Trinidad are adequate presentations of the ways of life of these two groups, what could I predict about the changes that have occurred as to the differential size of land holdings of the two groups. I found two parts of my model particularly useful for such prediction — the time orientation of the group, and its goals. The Creoles have a strong *present* time orientation and express this in their phrase "Now-for-Now." The Creoles believe that life is lived for the present and the future will take care of itself. The major goal appears to be "*fête*," that is living a hedo-

nistic type of life. The East Indians, on the other hand, have a strong *future* time orientation and continually speak of their plans for the future. Their major goal seems to be *family* improvement — in terms of increasing the size of the group, and its property holdings, and of continually attempting to improve relationships between family members.

From the models here presented, and especially from a study of the differential time orientations and goals of the two groups in question, one must come to the conclusion that, all other things being equal, Creoles should be losing land to East Indians and that such loss of land should be continuous. That is, given any particular time and comparing it with a base time, East Indians should be gaining land at the expense of Creoles. I analyzed the land holding figures in terms of 20-year periods, and found the results to be essentially those which were predicted by the models (see table 1).

Table 1

LAND HOLDING CHANGES IN TRINIDAD, 1900-1957
Land owned by Various Ethnic Groups and the Government

	<i>Year (As of Jan. 1)</i>			
	1900	1920	1940	1957
Total in Acres	1620	1620	1620	1620
Whites (Acres)	271	280	367	100
Creoles (Acres)	1013	917	731	657
East Indians (Acres)	336	394	509	637
Chinese (Acres)	0	29	13	0
Govt. Owned (Acres)	0	0	0	226
Percent of Total Land Owned By Creoles	62.5	56.6	45.1	40.5
Percent of Total Land Owned By East Indians	20.8	24.3	31.4	39.3

It is interesting to note that in approximately 60 years Creoles have, as a group, lost 22 per cent of the acreage under discussion and the East Indians have gained 18.5 per cent of this land. Further, at each 20-year period, Creoles have lost land and East Indians have gained land.³

³It should be mentioned that apart from Creoles and East Indians, Trinidad has a White and Chinese population. I did not study the cultures of White and Chinese Trinidadians and therefore made no predictions about these groups.

Prediction of the past would thus appear to be a useful tool for model verification. Obviously the more specific the predictions, the greater their value as "verifiers." It is possible that any of several different models could have predicted the changes here reported; the most useful model might then be the one with the most *specific* predicting abilities. Thus my model would have been a superior one if I could have predicted that the loss of land by Creoles and the gain of land by East Indians would be about 20 per cent. It would have been even better if I could have given figures such as: a 22 per cent loss for Creoles and an 18.5 per cent gain for East Indians. It is possible to predict various kinds of phenomena which have occurred in the past, the major requisite being that such phenomenon be related to the system from which the prediction is done. W. Leontief, for example, created a model for the structure of the American economy and then used statistics on economic processes in America for the years 1919-1939 to show the utility of his model.⁴

Although it is outside the scope of this paper to fully explore the theoretical value of using prediction of the past for model verification, some points raised in this paper have implications that should be briefly mentioned. Prediction of the past is only possible where data are available that are related to the model from which the predictions are being made. The data used for prediction in this paper were land holdings. Since prediction was possible here, it can be stated that land changes *are* a function of the cultures inhabiting the land. Or, more specifically, the land changes in the holdings of the Creoles and East Indians occurred *because of* the respective cultures of these two groups.

What implications does such a statement have for theories of culture change which rely heavily on the deterministic effects of environmental conditions? At very least, it would appear to necessitate a refinement of their position. If we should provisionally accept the theory that environment plays a role in the formation of culture, we must logically be led to the statement that: *environmental change should lead to culture change*. Let us assume that a group changed its environment and shortly thereafter it was apparent that culture change had also occurred. The im-

⁴I am indebted to Professor Emile Grunberg for referring me to W. Leontief's *The Structure of the American Economy 1919-1939*. (New York, Oxford University Press: 1953).

mediate cause of such change might very possibly be the new environment; however a prime cause of the culture change may well be the cultural system which could have caused the environmental change. To return to the Trinidad situation, if we assume that the land holding changes here described continue (and there is no reason to assume that they will not) there will come a time when Trinidadian Creoles are no longer peasant farmers. Should the new environment to which they go lead to culture change among the Creoles, such changes must be said to be ultimately caused by the previous cultural system of the Creoles, which led to loss of land and necessitated movement to new environments.

Perhaps the most sophisticated writers today on the environmental effects on culture are the cultural ecologists. What implications do the above statements have on their theory of culture change?

Cultural ecologists, in their writings,⁵ tend to stress the deterministic nature of cultural ecological adaptations. Briefly put, their argument runs as follows: A given area has certain exploitative possibilities. The way it is exploited by a given group with the technology available to them is the manner in which this group adapts to their environment. This adaptation, which is actually the interaction between technology and the culturally defined manner of exploiting the environment, is called *cultural ecology*. Cultural ecology is considered "creative process" which tends to influence cultural forms and patterns (Steward: 1955). As Steward sums up the position of the cultural ecologists (1955: 37):

"Cultures do, of course, tend to perpetuate themselves, and change may be slow for such reasons as those cited. But, *over the millenia cultures in different environments have changed tremendously, and these changes are basically traceable to new adaptations required by changing technology and productive arrangements.*" (italics inserted).

⁵See particularly:

- (a) Steward, Julian and Manners, Robert "The Cultural Study of Contemporary Societies: Puerto Rico." *American Journal of Sociology*. Vol. LIX, No. 2. 1953.
- (b) Steward, Julian: *Theory of Culture Change*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1955.
- (c) Steward, Julian, et al: *Peoples of Puerto Rico*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1956.

A conservative statement of the cultural ecological position could perhaps be provided by the following propositions:

1. Cultural ecology is functionally related to culture.
2. A change in the cultural ecology of a group tends to lead to culture change.

As has been shown above, a group may be led to change its habitat for cultural factors; its culture, that is, may not be able to compete with another culture in a given area. A new habitat may necessitate new modes of adaptation. A changed cultural ecology may thus be culturally caused and any effects of such a changed cultural ecology are, ultimately, also culturally caused. I would propose then a slight refinement in the cultural ecological position as follows:

1. Cultural ecology is functionally related to culture.
2. X factors may lead to a changed cultural ecology.
3. A change in the cultural ecology tends to lead to culture change.
4. X may at times be the cultural system in the group's previous cultural ecological situation.

The points here made can be more easily shown by a symbolization of the major variables. If we use (K) for culture; (E) for its related cultural ecology; (\rightarrow) for direction of causation⁶; and (X) for unknown factors; the cultural ecological position can be shown as:

$E_1 \rightarrow K_1$; $E_2 \rightarrow K_2$; $E_3 \rightarrow K_3$; etc.

Nothing is stated in this theory as to why E^1 should become E^2 . The refinement here proposed is:

$E_1 \rightarrow K_1$; $X_1 \rightarrow E_2 \rightarrow K_2$; $X_2 \rightarrow E_3 \rightarrow K_3$; etc.

Or when (X) and the cultural system which precedes it are one and the same, the above can be shown as:

$E_1 \rightarrow K_1 \rightarrow E_2 \rightarrow K_2 \rightarrow E_3 \rightarrow K_3$.

⁶The symbol (\rightarrow) should be read "tends to lead to the formation of."

In actuality the proposed refinement sets up a temporal sequence, and completes a causal chain of interrelated phenomena.

To summarize; it is possible in some situations to use prediction of the past as a means of verifying cultural models. Land holdings of peasant farmers are a possible source of such prediction, although any data related to the system from which predictions are being made could be used. Data which are quantitative are particularly useful, since more precise predictions can be made, and the more precise the prediction, the more complete is the verification of the model. The prediction of the direction of land changes in Trinidad partly verified the models here presented of Creole and East Indian cultures. More specific predictions would be necessary for a more complete verification. The ability of a cultural model to predict land changes suggests some inadequacies in the cultural ecological approach to culture change. It was shown that even if a change in the cultural ecology of a group leads to culture change, the change in the cultural ecology may itself be culturally determined.⁷

BIBLIOGRAPHY

References Cited:

FREILICH, MORRIS

1958—Cultural Persistence Among the Modern Iroquois. *Anthropos* 53: 473.

1960—Cultural Diversity Among Trinidadian Peasants. Unpub. Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University.

LEONTIEF, W.

1953—The Structure of the American Economy 1919-1939. New York. Oxford University Press.

LEVI-STRAUSS, CLAUDE

1953—Social Structure. *Anthropology Today*. Chicago University Press.

MEADOWS, PAUL

1957—Models, Systems and Science. *American Sociological Review*. 22:32.

STEWART, JULIAN H.

1955—Theory of Culture Change. Urbana. University of Illinois Press.

AND MANNERS, ROBERT

1953—The Cultural Study of Contemporary Societies. *American Journal of Sociology*. 59:123.

.....ET. AL.

1956—Peoples of Puerto Rico. Urbana. University of Illinois Press.

⁷I am greatly indebted to Professors Emile Grunberg, Samuel Newman, Robert Manners, and William Hardenbergh for their readings of early drafts of this paper and for their critical comments. The writer, however, accepts sole responsibility for the views here presented.

INDEX TO VOLUME 33

(Anthropological Quarterly)

- Amigocracy, 19
- artel* (corporative enterprise), 86-87
- Birth customs, Philippines, 129
- Brideprice, 118-119, 122
- campanilismo*, 25-27
- Child training, Tyrolean peasants, 106-114
- Clans, Guajiro, matrilineal, 116-117, 126-127
- Communities, in relation to society, 117; open, 178; tightly integrated, 178
- Class, social, 1; rural and urban, 12; in a Danish village, 99-105
- corredo* (trousseau), 34-39
- Cultural ecology, 196-197
- Culture change (Italy), 33-39; (Turkey), 42; (Ethiopia), 149-157; (India), 93-97
- Divination, casting of bones, 141
- Ethnography, activity bias, 158-163
- Evil Eye, 39
- Family, structure (India), 93; (Tyrolean), 109
- Feuding, 51, 73-74
- Godparenthood, 18, 111; *comparatio*, 30
- Inheritance, "seed to seed", 166 ff
- Kinship (Spain), 15; (Italy), 24; (Turkey), 40, 51
- kûs* (quiescent hostility), 54, 66
- Land, holdings, 189, 194; tenure and transmission (Barbados), 165 ff
- langue d'oc*, 3
- Lineage, patrilineal, 53; *qabilah*, 48
- Located labor system, 170
- Midwife, 129, 131, 132
- Models, cultural, 188 ff
- parda* (seclusion of women), 95-96
- Patronage (Spain), 14-24; (France), 2; (Martinique), 180
- Peasant, relation to city, 80-81; migration, 81-84; relation to market, 84-85; definitions, 77, 179
- Plantations, 170, 181-183
- Prediction, as check on cultural models, 190, 195
- Serfs, 76
- Settlement, patterns of, 182; common law, 172
- Societies, activist-perceptivist, 160-162
- Soul-concept, Bantu, 134
- Spirits, ancestral, 137-138; in dreams, 135-136; evil, associated with birth, 130-133
- Status, Guajiros, 118; ways of acquiring, 120, 121
- Tawsug, 129
- Technological change, Danish village, 102
- Typology, rural community forms, 177, 184-187
- Urbanization, Nigeria, 143
- Yoruba, 147





UNIVERSITY OF



LEWIS HENRY MORGAN **American Scholar**

By Carl Resek. Lewis Henry Morgan's youthful interest in the Iroquois Indians developed into a lifelong passion that brought him international fame. Here is a long-needed biography of a man whose life and thought are not only synonymous with the beginnings of American anthropology but a valuable index to the intellectual climate of his day. 4 pages of halftones. 184 pages. 1960. \$4.50

THE RITES OF PASSAGE

By Arnold van Gennep. For the first time in English — the famed French anthropologist's classic work on the significance of the transitional rituals of birth, puberty, marriage, and death. 198 pages. 1960. \$4.50


THE LITTLE COMMUNITY **and** **PEASANT SOCIETY AND CULTURE**

By Robert Redfield. A one-volume paperback reissue of two Redfield classics — the first exploring means by which anthropologists can understand the small community; the second indicating ways in which anthropology can move from the study of isolated primitive tribes to study complex civilized societies. 280 pages. 1960. A Phoenix book \$2.25

INDIAN LIFE IN THE UPPER GREAT LAKES **11,000 B.C. to A.D. 1800**

By George I. Quimby. The first comprehensive account of the early cultures and history of the Upper Great Lakes region—coordinating cultural and geological events into a meaningful interpretation of archeological findings. 208 pages. 75 illustrations. 1960. \$5.95

Through your bookseller
UNIVERSITY OF

 **Chicago PRESS** 5700 Ellis Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois
IN CANADA: The University of Toronto Press, Toronto 5, Ontario

UNIVERSITY OF



THE LEOPARD'S SPOTS **Scientific Attitudes Toward Race** **in America, 1815-59**

By William Stanton. Early in the nineteenth century a group of American scientists (known as the "American School") became convinced by their investigations that the races of man were actually distinct species. Here is an account of this vital and violently controversial period in American scientific history, its origins, and its effects on the American Dream. 245 pages, 1960. \$4.00

SONS OF THE SHAKING EARTH

By Eric R. Wolf. The people of Mexico and Guatemala—their land, history, pre-history, and culture—portrayed by an anthropologist with a gift for writing. Profusely illustrated with photographs and drawings. 303 pages. Illustrated. 1959. \$5.00

METHOD IN SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY

By A. R. Radcliffe-Brown. Edited by Mr. R. Srinivas. The papers of the late A. R. Radcliffe-Brown stand today as classic definitions of the scope and method of social anthropology. This selection makes his most influential work conveniently available. 216 pages. 1958. \$3.75

FIELD WORK **An Introduction to the Social Sciences**

By Buford H. Junker. Introduction by Everett C. Hughes. The author brings together all the known methods of field work in the social sciences. He discusses the meaning of field work; how the student observes, records, and reports his subject; the type of situation he encounters; his own adaptation to peculiarly demanding cases. 210 pages. 1960. Paper \$5.00

Through your bookseller

UNIVERSITY OF



Chicago PRESS 5755 Ellis Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois

IN CANADA: The University of Toronto Press, Toronto 6, Ontario

